

[US 010318]

REMARKSRECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 14 2007

I. INTRODUCTION

Claims 1 and 16-19 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 1, 3-7, and 9-19 remain pending in this application. It is respectfully submitted that based on the above amendments and the following remarks that all of the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 101 REJECTION SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

The Examiner has rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as unpatentable because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. (See 3/13/07 Office Action, p. 3). Specifically, the Examiner states that the scope of the presently claimed computer program "when executed" cannot be fully realized. As per the Examiner's recommendation, claim 19 has been amended to recite an "article of manufacture comprising a computer-readable storage medium storing, one or more software programs for processing content-related information for delivery to a processing device configured to support an electronic program guide of a first type, wherein the one or more software programs are executed on the processing device implementing the steps of..." (See 3/13/07 Office Action, p. 13). Thus, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner should withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claim 19.

III. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTION SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 4-7, 9-14, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,243,707 (Humbleman) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,167,564 (Fontana) in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,505,348 (Knowles). (See 3/13/07 Office Action, p. 3).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a method comprising, a "reference information object model defining a set of requirements, *the set of requirements relating to at least one type of*

[US 010318]

content” and “configuring at least a portion of the content-related information for consistency with corresponding portions of the reference information model when the content-related information satisfies the set of requirements.” The Examiner stated that the broadest interpretation of “a set of requirements,” as recited in claim 1, may include, for example, a format in which the EPG functions. However, as amended, the set of requirements has been further defined to include “at least one type of content.” That is, the set of requirements is content-related, not format related. None of the references describe the use of a set of requirements that is content-related. Support for this amendment may be found in at least the following locations in the specification. (See Specification, p. 10, l. 22 – p. 11, l. 5). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that neither Humpleman, Fontana, nor Knowles, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the above recitation of claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner should withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1. Because claims 4-7 and 9-14 depend from and, therefore, include all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable.

Claim 19 recites “the reference information object model defining a set of requirements, the set of requirements relating to at least one type of content” and “configuring at least a portion of the content-related information for consistency with corresponding portions of the reference information object model when the content-related information satisfies the set of requirements.” Thus, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable and the Examiner should withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 19.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,243,707 (Humpleman) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,167,564 (Fontana) in further view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,505,348 (Knowles) in further view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0073081 (Kido). (See 3/13/07 Office Action, p. 8).

Kido also does not disclose or suggest a “reference information object model defining a set of requirements, *the set of requirements relating to at least one type of content*” and “configuring at least a portion of the content-related information for consistency with corresponding portions of the reference information model when the content-related information

[US 010318]

satisfies the set of requirements,” as recited in claim 1. Therefore, neither Humpleman, Fontana, Knowles, nor Kido, either alone or in combination, disclose or suggest the above recitation of claim 1. Thus, because claims 3 and 15 depend from and, therefore, include all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable.

The Examiner has rejected claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,243,707 (Humpleman) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,167,564 (Fontana) in further view of U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0073081 (Kido). (See 3/13/07 Office Action, p. 9).

As discussed above, neither Humpleman, Fontana, nor Kido disclose or suggest a “reference information object model defining a set of requirements, the set of requirements relating to at least one type of content” and “configuring at least a portion of the content-related information for consistency with corresponding portions of the reference information model when the content-related information satisfies the set of requirements,” as recited in claim 1.

Claim 16 recites “defining a set of requirements for the reference information object model, the set of requirements relating to at least one type of content” and “configuring at least a portion of the received content-related information for consistency with corresponding portions of the reference information model, when the received content-related information satisfies the set of requirements.” Thus, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable for at least the same reasons stated above and the Examiner should withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 16.

Claim 17 recites “a processor operative to configure at least a portion of the content-related information for consistency with corresponding portions of a reference information object model that defines a set of requirements and is configured in accordance with a unified modeling language format, the set of requirements relating to at least one type of content, the portion of the content-related information so configured thereby upon satisfying the set of requirements being selectively extractable by at least the electronic program guide of the first type and at least a second electronic program guide of a second type different than the first type in accordance with a specified semantic and syntactic consensus, wherein the content-related information comprises

[US 010318]

one or more documents in an extensible markup language.” Thus, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable for at least the same reasons stated above and the Examiner should withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 17.

Claim 18 recites “a processor operative to implement at least a portion of the electronic program guide of the first type for processing the content-related information, at least a portion of the content-related information being configured for consistency with corresponding portions of a reference information object model that defines a set of requirements and is configured in accordance with a unified modeling language format, the set of requirements relating to at least one type of content, the portion of the content-related information so configured thereby upon satisfying the set of requirements being selectively extractable by at least the electronic program guide of the first type and at least a second electronic program guide of a second type different than the first type in accordance with a specified semantic and syntactic consensus, wherein the content-related information comprises one or more documents in an extensible markup language.” Thus, it is respectfully submitted that this claim is also allowable for at least the same reasons stated above and the Examiner should withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 18.

[US 010318]

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 14 2007

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.


Please direct all future correspondence to:

Yan Glickberg, Esq.
IP Counsel

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9618
Fax: (914) 332-0615
Email: yan.glickberg@philips.com

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 14, 2007


By: _____
Oleg F. Kaplun (Reg. No. 45,559)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, New York 10038
Tel: (212) 619-6000
Fax: (212) 619-0276